DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 643 SP 032 780

AUTHOR King, Irvin L.; Smith, James R.
TITLE The Role of the Partnership School in the Undergraduate Teacher Training Program at the University of Hawaii.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; School Restructuring; *School Role; Student Teacher Supervisors; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS National Network for Educational Renewal; *Professional Development Schools; University of Hawaii

ABSTRACT

Hawaii, through the Hawaii School/University Partnership, is 1 of 14 partnership states in the National Network for Educational Renewal. The partnership envisions the use of partnership schools to improve the quality of teacher training while simultaneously renewing and revitalizing the schools. This paper examines the role the partnership schools might play in the undergraduate teacher training program at the University of Hawaii, focusing on the following topics: (1) features of the partnership school; (2) roles of university and school staff; (3) difficulties associated with establishing secondary level partnership schools; (4) selection of school sites; and, (5) advantages and problems for the college, college coordinator, classroom teacher, and school. Recommendations are made for following a cautious approach in the establishment of partnership schools in Hawaii. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED330643

The Role of the Partnership School in the Undergraduate Teacher Training Program at the University of Hawaii

Irvin L. King

and

James R. Smith

Division of Field Services

College of Education

University of Hawaii

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 032 780

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Irvin L. King

James R. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

The Hawaii School/University Partnership is one of fourteen partnership states in the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) under the leadership of Dr. John Goodlad. The partnership envisions the use of partnership schools to improve the quality of teacher training while simultaneously renewing and revitalizing the schools. This paper examines the role which the partnership schools might play in the undergraduate teacher training program at the University of Hawaii. Recommendations are made for following a cautious approach in the establishment of partnership schools in Hawaii.

Introduction

The Hawaii School/University Partnership (HSUP) is one of fourteen partnership states in the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) under the leadership of Dr. John Goodlad. The partnership, which consists of the University of Hawaii, the Hawaii State Department of Education, and the Kamehameha Schools, was formed in 1986. The members of the partnership envision using partnership schools as a major focal point for bringing the best minds together "to solve collaboratively the major problems related to the education of school-age youth in Hawaii."

HSUP envisions the formation of partnership schools as a possible way for facilitating needed change. For the past several years the College of Education has been developing a new Master of Science in Teaching (MST) program in which a cadre of students will be placed at a partnership school under the direction of a university supervisor. This will allow for in-depth field experiences not now available to teachers in training. In addition to providing a fertile training ground for prospective teachers, it is hoped that the collaboration between university and school personnel will also result in revitalizing the schools. The first students are slated to enroll in the MST in the fall of 1991.

In June of 1990 we were asked by Dr. Philip Whitesell, Associate Dean of the College of Education, to review the literature on Professional Development Schools and to do some thinking about the role which such schools might play in our current undergraduate teacher training program. One of us had served on a Professional Development School Committee during the 1988-1989 academic year, and Carl Daeufer, our department chairman, had served on the committee this past year. We had also attended a Hawaii Partnership meeting during the summer of 1989 at which John Goodlad was the featured speaker, and this past semester we attended another meeting on the Hawaii Partnership at the Honolulu Country Club. So it was with some knowledge and a good deal of interest that we approached the task.

During our deliberations we met with a number of key individuals, including: Dr. John Dolly, Dean of College of Education; Dr. Phil Whitesell, Associate Dean of the College of Education; Juvenna Chang, Executive Director of the Hawaii School/University Partnership; Dr. Carl Daeufer, Director of the Division of Field Services; and Ann Port and Ronald Toma, Personnel Specialists with the Hawaii State Department of Education. Their comments were enlightening and very helpful in giving us direction for this task. We also reviewed the

literature and discussed the topic with each other on many occasions.

The result of these efforts is reported herein. Our report consists of two parts. In Part One we discuss the role of the partnership school in the undergraduate teacher education program from the college coordinator point of view. We see the role of such schools in the undergraduate program as being somewhat different than in the emerging Master of Science in Teaching program. In Part Two we describe the next steps which need to be taken in Hawaii to examine the role which the partnership school might play in our undergraudate program. A bibliography of related articles is also attached to our report.

We have tried to be honest and candid in our comments. We present our ideas as a first effort at thinking about the professional development school in the undergraduate program and hope that our opinions will serve as a springboard for further discussion throughout the state of Hawaii.

Part One: About Partnership Schools

The Current Plan

The Hawaii State Department of Education will be submitting a proposal to the Hawaii State Legislature for funds to establish eight partnership schools during the 1991-1992 academic year. Although the final details are yet to be

made, it is expected that four or five schools will be devoted to the new MST program. We anticipate having two partnership schools for our undergraduate program.

The budget for the proposed project includes monies for one off-ratio teacher for every six cooperating teachers, one part-time teacher for every two cooperating teacher, and several days of substitute teaching for each cooperating teacher. Among other things, the extra personnel will enable the cooperating teachers to be released from their classrooms to perform professional functions such as planning and/or research.

Purposes of the Partnership School

In Hawaii the term "Partnership School" is being used instead of "Professional Development School." We feel the distinction is an important one. "Professional Development School" is a rather pedantic title which reflects the major interests of the university. That is, we want to develop professional educators at the schools. The term "Partnership School", on the other hand, conveys the feeling that we are in this thing together for the common purpose of improving the entire educational landscape. We think the choice of terms here is a fortuitious one.

The concept of the Partnership School is based upon the hypothesis that the schools and the College of Education can

work together as equal partners in a "symbiotic relationship" to significantly improve both the schools themselves and the quality of the teacher education programs which take place within them. Hence, there are two major purposes for the formation of a partnership school. The first is to improve the quality of the curriculum, the teaching, and the learning in the partnership school. The second is to improve the quality of the observation/participation and student teaching experiences for undergraduate students. While there might be some overlap, these goals are not identical; one can be achieved without the other. But ideally, real improvement in schools will result in real improvement in teacher training, and vice versa. This is the goal of the partnership school.

We see the improvement of the teacher education program as being quite feasible, and we discuss this in more detail in this paper. However, we have some reservations about the involvement of the undergraduate faculty in "school renewal". The process of school change is very complex. Sarason (1975) observed that in spite of grand intentions, very few educational innovations have actually worked (sadly, most have failed). We think this is so because, in spite of outward appearances, it is difficult to get "gut-level" agreement on what is really important in teaching. We all have biases, but for one reason or another - not the least of

which is survival - many of us have never made these biases public. For example, one of Brainard's conditions for a good PDS was that tracking by ability be eliminated. Many excellent teachers think tracking is the only rational way to organize the curriculum, so we are not surprised that none of the PDSs which Brainard surveyed had eliminated tracking. We can think of dozens of other such issues over which agreement would be difficult to achieve. To make matters worse, many of our biases are subconscious ones which we have never consciously scrutinized. As a result, teachers often sabotage new programs without even realizing they are doing so.

These "gut-level" differences do not exist solely at the school level, they exist at the University as well. In fact, it is the existence of such differences which have precluded the College of Education from developing a more comprehensive and systematic course of study for the Bachelor of Education degree. For this reason we do not see "school renewal" as a high priority goal during the first years of a partnership; we are reluctant to ask the schools to undertake what we ourselves have been unable to accomplish. The idea of renewing the college curriculum as we simultaneously renew the schools is an idea whose time has not yet arrived, John Goodlad notwithstanding!

We intend these comments solely for the partnership school within the undergraduate program - they do not represent our thinking about the new Master of Science in Teaching (MST) degree which is currently on the drawing board. From our perspective there is one major difference between the BEd and MST, and that difference is a crucial one: the MST is a new program whereas the BEd has a long tradition with established expectations and ways of doing things. Prior attempts to change the entire BEd program (FUTEP) or to modify portions of it have not been successful for a variety of reasons, including inertia and faculty resistance. An abrupt changeover to the partnership schools which require new roles for faculty members would, in our opinion, meet a similar fate. This is especially so in light of the fact that the partnership school phenomenon has not as yet proven itself on the battlefield (Brainard, p. 49).

On the other hand, the MST program starts with a clean slate. Roles of professors and cooperating teachers and student teachers are defined, not redefined. Courses are developed, not revised. Procedures are created, not changed. The simultaneous improvement of both schools and teacher training might flourish under such conditions.

While we do not see school renewal as a priority of the undergraduate program during the first year of the

partnership, it might be a by-product of the partnership. Teachers in the school will assume a more responsible and professional role in the preparation of teachers. Many will take additional courses. Their status will be increased. They will have release time for planning and collaboration. They will be exposed to more direct interaction with the university faculty in problem solving situations. The end result of such changes might be a revitalized school faculty, and this in itself might result in significant renewal within the school.

Similarly, if the new Masters of Science in Teaching program is a success, and if initial experiences with partnership schools in the undergraduate program are productive, perhaps the college faculty will gravitate towards "renewal". But overall, we favor evolution to revolution!

Features of the Partnership School

By entering into the partnership agreement both the school and the College of Education are committing themselves to three years of joint cooperation. In the first year of operation it is envisioned that the partnership school will be the training site for at least six student teachers and ten observation/participation students; the numbers might expand in succeeding years. To facilitate placements, more

than one student teacher and several observation/participation students might be placed with a given cooperating teacher. Current plans call for one off-ratio teacher and a part-time teacher to assist the partnership. Monies for a limited number of days of "substitute teachers" has also been budgeted. This extra help should make it possible for the cooperating teachers to have time to meet during the regular school day to plan and collaborate on a variety of activities. One college coordinator will be assigned to the school.

A committed, supportive administrator who has demonstrated leadership skill and who has good rapport with the teachers is essential to establishing an appropriate climate for developing a partnership school. From our viewpoint, it would be wise to select a school that has several committed teachers who have had extensive successful experience working with student teachers and observation/participation students. This core of teachers could be helpful in recruiting other teachers in the school to the program.

The faculty of the Division of Field Services is fully aware of the personal and professional qualities needed to effectively supervise undergraduate students and of the time and training it takes to develop effective supervisory

skills. Not all excellent teachers make effective supervisors; neither do marginal teachers. Care must be taken in setting up a training program for preparing interested supervising teachers.

During the orientation and implementation period the program should be kept as simple as possible. The program should move no faster than the faculty is able. The college coordinator would be on site more than is presently the case and would be available to coordinate, assist and encourage. Planning meetings should be held with the faculty and appropriate Department of Education and College of Education partnership staff. The school faculty must be involved in the decision-making from the beginning, and it is essential that their ideas and concerns be heard.

An experienced college coordinator should be selected, preferably one who has previously established a good reputation in the school. The coordinator's commitment should be for the same duration as that of the school's faculty. An unanswered question in our minds is the relationship between the college coordinator and the Department of Education's complex coordinator. (NOTE: the complex coordinator position has been dropped since this paper was initially written).

This program will require appropriate space to function as intended. College coordinators will need office space where confidential conferences can be held with two or three persons. Room for seminars of 12 student teachers will be required. Workspace for off-ratio, part-time teachers, etc., will be needed. Compromises in space might adversely affect the program.

The ideas presented in Exemplary Sites for the Education of Educators and School Renewal (the March 1990 HSUP Partnership task force report) and the Concept Paper on Professional Development Schools (prepared by a committee from the DOE, COE, HSTA and HGEA-EO) appear to be reasonable guidelines to follow.

The College of Education needs to submit a budget similar to the one proposed by the Department of Education. Additional clerical help, supplies, substitute teachers, part-time teachers, and an off-ratio teacher will enable to school staff to function as true professionals on an equal footing with the College faculty.

Roles of the Key Players

If the key players in the partnership are unclear about their roles and relationships, misunderstandings are possible. A clear organizational chart should be developed to show how DOE and COE personnel are to function in carrying

out their roles and responsibilities. It is especially important to clarify the roles of the Department of Education complex coordinator, the school principal, the college coordinator, and the classroom teachers.

The Steering Committee. A steering committee should formulate long-range goals, do the long-range financial planning, and monitor the overall project. It is not clear how much autonomy the partnership school needs in order to succeed. In April 1990 the NEA Educational Partnership Conference was held in Washington, D.C.. It spells out helpful guidelines for starting partnerships, identifies characteristics of successful partnerships and lists 12 critical ingredients common to the development of successful partnerships. These should be consulted by the steering committee. In addition, members of the steering committee, or their designees, should work closely with the college coordinator.

The College Coordinator. The role of the college coordinator is a pivotal one in the partnership. If the role remains the same as it has been, the coordinator will conduct a weekly student teacher seminar, visit each student teacher at least five times during the semester, and schedule three-way conferences when they are needed. The partnership arrangement will add several new tasks to this list,

including: 1) meeting on a regular basis with the cooperating teachers; 2) interviewing and placing the student teachers; 3) meeting with the observation/participation teachers; 4) placing and supervising the observation/participation students; 5) meeting, planning, and communicating with college instructors; 6) coordinating with the DOE complex coordinator; 7) participating in making decisions about the use of the extra partnership personnel; 8) communicating with the school principal; 9) becoming familiar with both school and DOE policies and programs; 10) interpreting the college undergraduate program to the school faculty; 11) meeting with other appropriate partnership personnel; 12) assisting in identifying the inservice needs of the school; 13) recruiting new OP host teachers and cooperating teachers; and 14) attending appropriate school meetings (School-Based Management, PTA, etc.).

It is obvious that this cannot occur if the role and load of the coordinator remain unchanged. Either the role of the coordinator must change, or the number of student teachers per coordinator must be reduced. One possibility is to drastically reduce the number of times a coordinator visits each student teacher. Research has shown that the College Coordinator has little overall impact upon the performance of the student teacher. It could, therefore, be

argued that relinquishing the visitation responsibility would not substantially affect the student teaching experience. If visitations were eliminated, a great deal of time would be available to the coordinator. It might even be possible to increase the number of student teachers a coordinator could supervise. The effect this will have on the quality of the student teaching is open to debate. These and related issues will be discussed by the Field Services faculty during the coming year.

The Cooperating Teacher. If the role of the college coordinator remains unchanged, then the role of the cooperating teacher would remain essentially the same. Possible new or altered roles could include: 1) working with more than one student teacher; 2) working with observation/participation students; 3) sharing and collaborating with other cooperating teachers and observation/participation teachers; 4) participating in student teaching seminars; and 5) attending meetings and workshops related to partnership activities. If the role of the college coordinator changes, then the cooperating teacher would assume more responsibility for evaluating the performance of the student teachers.

The Observation/Participation Host Teacher. The role of the host teacher would remain basically the same, which is to

provide the observation/participation student with a variety of classroom experiences and opportunities. As the program gains structure, more frequent reporting may be required. The host teacher will also need to attend periodic feedback and planning sessions with other observation/participation teachers.

The Off-Ratio Teacher, Part-Time Teachers, and Clerks. The roles of the additional partnership staff will be determined by the members of the partnership school. In our travels around Department of Education classrooms we have observed some cases in which an additional teacher in the classroom is more trouble than he or she is worth. This usually occurs when the extra teacher is not a self-starter or is slow on the up-take. If the roles and responsibilities of these extra personnel are clearly defined, perhaps such problems can be minimized.

Concerns about the Secondary Level

Several factors make the establishment of a partnership school potentially more difficult at the secondary level than at the elementary school level. The first is the size factor. Most secondary schools are much larger than the typical elementary school, and as a result communication is a major problem. The second factor mitigating against the establishment of a partnership school at the secondary school

is specialization. At the elementary school level nearly all teachers are generalists who teach everything in the curriculum. As a result, teachers feel more of a common bond to one another and are accustomed to working together as a team in addressing problems. At the secondary level teachers tend to identify with their subject matter specialty, and even within this small social unit many teachers function almost independently of one another. The final factor is tradition. In the past secondary seminars for student teachers have been organized around subject matter specialties. If only one college coordinator is to be assigned to a given school, then either this tradition must be ended or entire academic departments must become involved in the training of teachers. Given these facts, several options are possible:

1) The first option is for an entire school to become the official partnership unit. This would mean that the college coordinator would conduct seminars for student teachers and relate to teachers in all subject matter areas. While this presents a challenge to the coordinator (both intellectually and interpersonally), it also presents new opportunities for addressing school-wide problems.

2) The second option is to form the partnership unit within one or two related departments in a school. For

example, the Mathematics and Science departments might comprise the unit. In order to place an adequate number of student teachers in the school, this might mean that all teachers would have to take student teachers. Such an arrangement would make it possible to address more specific problems in the school.

3) The third option is to form the partnership with a School Within a School. Castle High School has such a program, and others have existed in Hawaii.

4) The final option is to form a network of teachers in a given subject matter area in different schools within a given geographical area. While this might appear to be the least desirable of the options, it nonetheless has the potential for bringing teachers and professors together for the common purpose of improving education. Who knows what might be accomplished?

Selection of School Sites

Several approaches can be taken in the selection of partnership schools. One approach is to publicize the general requirements and responsibilities and accept applications from school principals. This has the advantage of opening up opportunities to schools which have previously not been involved in teacher training. From our perspective it would be more feasible to select schools which are already

involved with the College of Education in training teachers. Currently there are several schools which have a number of cooperating teachers, and the school principals have expressed an interest in exploring the partnership concept. Basic expectations and working relationships have been established, making the expansion to a full partnership school much easier. The Field Services faculty, in cooperation with the Department of Education, will further explore the possibility of using this approach in the selection of partnership schools during the coming academic year.

Advantages of a Partnership School

For the College. One of the major expected advantages for the College is the improvement in the quality of our Observation/Participation practicum which occurs prior to the student teaching experience. With an on-site college coordinator and a host of teachers who are willing to assist, it should be possible to greatly increase the number and type of observation/participation experiences for our students. Additionally, the on-site coordinator can monitor these experiences and conduct seminars to ensure a common set of experiences for all students. It is also hoped that the on-site coordinator can help facilitate better coordination between the university course instructors and

observation/participation host teachers. Since the college coordinator will also be responsible for arranging the student teaching and observation/participation placements in the school, the Director of Field Services will be able to devote more time to his leadership role.

For the College Coordinator. If the student teachers assigned to a given college coordinator are concentrated in one or two schools (instead of ten or twelve), travel time will be decreased dramatically. This will enable the coordinator to be on-site a greater percentage of the time. This should result in better communication, more support for the student teacher, and better rapport with the classroom teachers. It might also enable the coordinator to become engaged in meaningful research projects which are beneficial to both the school and the college. If the role of the college coordinator changes significantly, as is discussed in Part IV below, other advantages might accrue.

For the Classroom Teacher. The role of the cooperating teacher and observation/participation host teacher will change. Hopefully, the role will be seen as more professionally rewarding. Stipends might be increased, and perhaps there will be some increase in status for teachers in a partnership school.

The roles of the classroom teachers might also be clarified. Nearly everyone agrees that our current observation/participation program is inadequate. There is a great deal of inconsistency in its implementation, and teachers are often confused about the intent of the program. If an on-site college coordinator is available to clarify expectations, the teacher's job should become more focused and more enjoyable. It might also be possible to arrange meetings between the university course instructors and the classroom teachers, thus further defining the role of the observation/participation host teacher.

Similar advantages would accrue to the cooperating teacher. The plan calls for a given coordinator to remain at a school for a three-year period of time. This should provide continuity and more productive relationships between the classroom teachers and coordinator. This will enable the coordinator to learn more about the school and the teachers to learn more about the undergraduate program at the University.

For the School. The budgetary and personnel support provided the school in the partnership program should be a definite advantage to the school. The related activities with the teachers working with college students and faculty will provide a degree of professional revitalization for the

programs in which the supervising teachers are involved. This revitalization of the faculty may be the major focus of "school renewal" during the first few years of the project. If the partnership flourishes, it is possible that school renewal might encompass changes in curriculum and school policies.

Potential Problems

For the College Coordinator. To function as a leader, the coordinator will have to become knowledgeable in several areas, including the current College of Education curriculum and a variety of Department of Education programs and policies. Since the coordinator will be committed to the partnership school for a three-year period, and since there will be more persons in the school directly involved in the teacher training effort, it is essential that good relations be established and maintained with all of the partnership staff. This will require a greater degree of leadership and interpersonal skills than was formerly required of the coordinator. As Ruscoe (1989) points out, "*The evaluative and judgmental conclusions of much traditional research would destroy the fragile partnership which ethnographic research attempts to foster.*" In particular, care must be taken to avoid labeling teachers within the school as "good" or "bad" depending on their compliance to someone's preconceived

notions of good teaching. If the partnership school is to function, every teacher must have confidence that his or her dignity and reputation will be protected (and defended, if necessary) by the university faculty. It is really a matter of professionalism: if a classroom teacher permits us to send college students into his or her classroom to observe, and if the students subsequently report unflattering opinions about what transpired in that classroom, then we think it is our professional obligation to interpret the reported events in as favorable a light as possible so as to avoid casting blame upon the teacher.

While this is not always easy to do, we think it is possible if you make a sincere effort to "walk in the other person's moccasins." For example, suppose a teacher yells and screams at his students. Rather than saying he is a bad teacher, it would be much more educational to withhold judgment and explore the reasons why a teacher might yell. Most teachers yell at one time or another. As classroom teachers, both of us have resorted to the tactic. By discussing the factors which might have contributed to the yelling, we can avoid judging the teacher and at the same time help our students gain a truer understanding of the behavior. In this way we can challenge our students to develop strategies which will make yelling unnecessary. To

protect the integrity of our relationship with the partnership teacher, we can say that while in the ideal world it is better not to yell at students, in the real world some teachers do yell because it is their way of coping.

This is a very potent topic which deserves a great deal of further discussion. It might be useful to openly discuss this topic with the partnership teachers prior to the formation of a partnership.

For the College. We foresee three potential problems for the College. The first is the development and implementation of a solid observation and participation program. There is general agreement within the College that observation and participation is an important component of the undergraduate teacher training program. Pulling everyone together, however, will be a challenge. Aggressive leadership is needed in this effort. The second potential problem lies in finding enough willing and able cooperating teachers at a given school site to have a quality program. Not every good teacher makes a good cooperating teacher; finding high quality cooperating teachers has always been a problem. It might be difficult to find enough "exemplary" teachers. The third potential problem lies with the faculty and staff at these partnership schools. We must strive to avoid creating a schism between the "good" teachers who we

use and the "poor" ones who we do not use. Careful thought should be given to this issue prior to beginning the partnership.

For the School. There are several potential problems for the school. First, the school principal will have additional duties and supervision to perform. Since the principal is volunteering for the partnership, we assume these added duties will be cheerfully absorbed by the principal. A second problem might be the additional space needed to operate the partnership school as we envision it. Some of the schools we currently visit do not have additional space, so it might pose a problem for some schools. A third problem might arise if the faculty is not satisfied with the college coordinator assigned to the school. Misunderstandings can arise, and if not resolved, such problems could undermine the program. Another problem could arise if the partnership arrangement disrupts the normal school operations. Conflicts between traditional policies and innovations are possible, and they should be resolved before they become a problem. For example, what if some teachers wanted to continue the observance of May Day while others did not? A final potential problem for the school was mentioned above: the partnership arrangement might divide the faculty into the "haves" and the "have-nots". Such feelings

already exist (in small degree) in some of the schools in which we currently have student teachers. We need to think of ways to avoid such problems.

For the Cooperating Teacher. One of our major concerns is that teachers will be so overwhelmed with additional work, stress, and responsibility that they will burnout. There are several potential sources for such stress. If the college coordinator no longer makes regular visits to observe student teachers, the cooperating teacher will have a greater responsibility for the evaluation of the student teacher. The traditional relationship between the CT, ST, and CC will thus be changed. This could cause some adjustment problems. The presence of the off-ratio teacher and the part-time teacher might also create problems for the cooperating teacher. As mentioned earlier, if they are not competent, they can be more trouble than they are worth. The teachers will be required to attend a variety of meetings on such topics as "research" or "school renewal" projects, the placement of college students, student teaching seminars, evaluation of student teachers, and general planning sessions. Some teachers do not like meetings, and care should be taken to keep all such meetings as short and meaningful as possible. While it might be "professional" for teachers to arrive early and stay late in order to do a good

job, it is not reasonable (nor advisable) to expect this of the cooperating teacher. We strongly feel that the cooperating teachers should be able to perform their jobs during the regular school day. The existence of an off-ratio, part-time, and substitute teachers will hopefully make this possible.

For the Student. Some of the very good cooperating teachers we know do not want student teachers every semester because they feel it is unfair to their students. As unpopular as this idea may appear, we feel it is a legitimate concern, especially for "at-risk" students who need the best teaching possible. Repeated exposure to weak and inexperienced student teachers must be avoided.

Part Two: Steps to Be Taken

Field Services deliberations. During the coming academic year the faculty of the Division of Field Services will discuss the Partnership School in greater detail. A portion of our first retreat has already been devoted to the topic. A key issue will be the role of the coordinator. It has been suggested that the coordinator not visit student teachers on a regular basis, leaving the evaluation of the student teacher to the cooperating teacher and freeing the coordinator to perform other duties for the partnership. This will require a great deal of discussion. The selection

of school sites is another pressing item, for current plans call for the first schools to go into operation in 1991. With this in mind, a model for incorporating the partnership school into the undergraduate program needs to be developed in the very near future. Quite obviously this should involve the total college faculty.

Dialogue with the College of Education Faculty. To date the discussions on the partnership schools have been conducted primarily within task forces or committees. The role of partnership schools in the emerging Master of Science in Teaching degree has been discussed within each department in the College, but little has been said about the role of partnership schools in the undergraduate program. Someone should be assigned the responsibility of carrying the discussion to the entire faculty during the coming year. Perhaps a College-wide Congress meeting can be devoted to a discussion of the partnership school.

Exploring potential sites. There are several schools which already present themselves as potential partnership school sites. There are a number of cooperating teachers already in the schools, the principals have expressed an interest in exploring the idea of becoming partnership schools, and there are Field Services faculty members who are potentially interested in the schools. The commitment of the

school faculty is the remaining key element. During the coming year, with the agreement of the Department of Education, our faculty will explore the extent of faculty interest.

The Hawaii School/University Partnership (HSUP). Since the partnership involves the schools and the university, HSUP should continue to be a focal point for the discussion of professional development schools. It is our opinion that this HSUP partnership must become more participatory. At the present time many faculty members are unaware of HSUP and the potential impact its activities might have upon the college curriculum. Now is the time for the involvement of the faculty. Communication with the Department of Education and with the PETOM program is also crucial. Perhaps the current Task Force should remain in force to continue and broaden the scope of the dialogue on partnership schools.

Bibliography

Anderson, D. & Morgan, B. A University-Schools Partnership: Prospects and Promises. Paper presented at the Regional Hearing of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, San Francisco, 1984.

Brainard, Frank. Professional Development Schools: Status as of 1989. Occasional Paper No. 9, Institute for the Study of Education Policy, University of Washington, December 1989.

Cuban, Larry. The Holmes Group Report: Why Reach Exceeds Grasp. Teachers College Record. vol. 88, no. 3, p. 348-53, Spring 1987

Darling-Hammond, Linda. Accountability for Professional Practice. Teachers College Record, Vol. 91, pp. 59-80, Fall 1989.

Ervay, Stuart & Sparks, William. The Quality-Based Progression Model of Teacher Education. Teacher Educator, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 28-32, Winter 1988-89.

Hawaii School/University Partnership. Exemplary Sites for the Education of Educators and School Renewal. University of Hawaii, March 1990.

Hopkins, Scott & Moore, Kenneth. Professional Development Schools: An Exploratory Approach. Paper presented at the Northwest Association of Teacher Educators, Tacoma, July 1989.

Joyce, Bruce. Reflections on "Tomorrow's Teachers". Teachers College Record, Vol. 88, No. 3, pp. 390-93, Spring 1987.

Kyle, Diane & Hovda, Ric. Teachers as Action Researchers: A Discussion of Developmental Organizational, and Policy Issues. Peabody Journal of Education, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 80-95, Winter 1987.

Meyen, Edward. Schools of Education and the Evolving Nature of Partnerships. Educational Considerations. Vol. 15, No.3, pp. 13-16, Fall 1988.

Professional Development School Committee. Concept Paper on Professional Development Schools University of Hawaii, August 1989.

Sarason, Seymour (1971). The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schlecty, Philip & others. Inventing the Professional Development Schools. Educational Leadership. Vol. 46, No..3, pp. 28-31, Nov 1988.

Theobald, Neil. The Financing and Governance of Professional Development or Partnership Schools. National Network for Educational Renewal News, Vol. 4, No. 1. Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1990.

Zimpher, Nancy. *Creating Professional Development School Sites*. Theory into Practice, Vol. XXIX, No. 1, pp. 42-49.